



Texas Department of Insurance

Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

518-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

RENAISSANCE HOSPITAL
C/O BURTON & HYDE PLLC
PO BOX 684749
AUSTIN TX 78768-4749

Respondent Name

ACE AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY

Carrier's Austin Representative Box

Box Number 15

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-06-1439-01

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "Enclosed are two copies of additional documentation relevant to this fee dispute. Also enclosed are two copies of EOB's from other carrier's, which show a higher rate of reimbursement, consistent to our usual and customary. We are requesting that our claims be paid at the usual and customary."

Amount in Dispute: \$2,006.40

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "Carrier responded to both original billing and request for reconsideration. Both denied for authorization."

Response Submitted by: SRS 300 S. State St., One Park Place, Syracuse, New York 13202

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

| Dates of Service | Disputed Services | Amount In Dispute | Amount Due |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------|
| November 19, 2004 | Outpatient CT Scans | \$ 2,006.40 | \$0.00 |

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307 sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, effective May 16, 2002, 27 *Texas Register* 4047, requires that "Reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, §413.011 until such period that specific fee guidelines are established by the commission."

3. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
4. This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on October 24, 2005. Pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3), effective January 1, 2003, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, the Division notified the requestor on November 7, 2005 to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute as set forth in the rule.
5. U.S. Bankruptcy Judge Michael Lynn issued a "STIPULATION AND ORDER GRANTING RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY TO PERMIT CONTINUANCE AND ADJUDICATION OF DISPUTED WORKERS COMPENSATION CLAIMS BEFORE THE TEXAS STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS," dated August 27, 2010, in the case of *In re: Renaissance Hospital – Grand Prairie, Inc. d/b/a/ Renaissance Hospital – Grand Prairie, et al.*, in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division in Case No. 08-43775-7. The order lifted the automatic stay to allow continuance of the claim adjudication process as to the workers' compensation receivables before SOAH, effective October 1, 2010. The order specified John Dee Spicer as the Chapter 7 trustee of the debtor's estate. By letter dated October 5, 2010, Mr. Spicer provided express written authorization for Cass Burton of the law office of Burton & Hyde, PLLC, PO Box 684749, Austin, Texas 78768-4749, to be the point of contact on Mr. Spicer's behalf relating to matters between and among the debtors and the Division concerning medical fee disputes. The Division will utilize this address in all communications with the requestor regarding this medical fee dispute.
6. The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:
 - A – PRE-AUTHORIZATION NOT OBTAINED.
 - 62 – PAYMENT DENIED/REDUCED FOR ABSENCE OF, OR EXCEEDED, PRE-CERTIFICATION/ AUTHORIZATION. PROCEDURE NOT APPROVED BY PRE-AUTHORIZATION.
 - 62 – PAYMENT DENIED/REDUCED FOR ABSENCE OF, OR EXCEEDED, PRE-CERTIFICATION/ AUTHORIZATION. PREAUTHORIZATION REQUIRED BUT NOT REQUESTED.

Findings

1. The insurance carrier denied disputed services with reason code 62 – "PAYMENT DENIED/REDUCED FOR ABSENCE OF, OR EXCEEDED, PRE-CERTIFICATION/ AUTHORIZATION. PROCEDURE NOT APPROVED BY PRE-AUTHORIZATION" and "PREAUTHORIZATION REQUIRED BUT NOT REQUESTED." 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.600(b), effective March 14, 2004, Volume 29 *Texas Register*, page 2349, provides, in pertinent part, that "The carrier is liable for all reasonable and necessary medical costs relating to the health care: (1) listed in subsection (h) or (i) of this section, only when the following situations occur: (A) an emergency, as defined in §133.1 of this title (relating to Definitions); (B) preauthorization of any health care listed in subsection (h) of this section was approved prior to providing the health care..." Review of the services billed finds that CT scans are not listed as services that require preauthorization in §134.600(h). The services billed were CT scans without the use of a contrast agent; the disputed services were not discograms. No documentation was found to support that the billed services were repeat diagnostic studies. The insurance carrier's denial code is not supported. The disputed services will therefore be reviewed per applicable Division rules and fee guidelines.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv), effective January 1, 2003, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not state how the submitted documentation supports the requestor's position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv).
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(D), effective January 1, 2003, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to provide "documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement." Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
 - The requestor's position statement asserts that "We are requesting that our claims be paid at the usual and customary."
 - The Division has previously found that "hospital charges are not a valid indicator of a hospital's costs of providing services nor of what is being paid by other payors," as stated in the adoption preamble to the Division's former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, Volume 22 *Texas Register* page 6276. It further states that "Alternative methods of reimbursement were considered... and rejected because they

use hospital charges as their basis and allow the hospitals to affect their reimbursement by inflating their charges..." (pages 6268-6269). Therefore, the use of a hospital's "usual and customary" charges cannot be favorably considered when no other data or documentation was submitted to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.

- The requestor's position statement asserts that "Also enclosed are two copies of EOB's from other carrier's, which show a higher rate of reimbursement, consistent to our usual and customary." However, no copies of EOB's from other carriers were found in the submitted documentation.
- The requestor did not explain how payment of its usual and customary charges would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.
- The requestor did not submit documentation to support that payment in the amount of its usual and customary charges would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.
- The requestor has not supported that payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

Conclusion

The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amounts sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307. The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

Authorized Signature

| | | |
|-----------|--|---------------------|
| _____ | Grayson Richardson | _____ April 5, 2012 |
| Signature | Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer | Date |

YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision*** together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party**.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.